

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2 and 5 are pending and being considered. It is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable, and reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,434,471 (“Asada et al.”).

Claim 1 recites, inter alia, the following:

an arrangement for **increasing, given a decrease in the time gap, at least one of a maximum possible vehicle acceleration and a maximum possible vehicle deceleration implementable by a speed control system** so that the vehicle is capable of at least one of accelerating and decelerating more quickly given the decrease in the time gap.

As regards this feature, the Examiner relies on col. 5, line 40 to col. 6, line 4 of Asada et al. However, this section of Asada et al. does not identically disclose, or even suggest, increasing a maximum possible vehicle acceleration or a maximum possible vehicle deceleration implementable by a speed control system. Instead, Asada et al. explicitly states that “the vehicle speed control section 23 limits the acceleration to a predetermined maximum acceleration a_{max} which, in this example, is equal to 0.06 G” and nowhere does Asada et al. indicate changing this predetermined maximum value. (Asada et al., col. 5, lines 57 to 59 (emphasis added)). Thus, the maximum acceleration of Asada et al. is predetermined, and is not increased, given a decrease in the time gap. Further, Asada et al. specifically teaches away from increasing a maximum possible vehicle acceleration or a maximum possible vehicle deceleration because it seeks to prevent “unwanted and uncomfortable acceleration or deceleration.” (Asada et al., col. 1, lines 19 to 20).

Claim 1 also recites, inter alia, the following:

an arrangement for **first activating, given the decrease in the time gap, deceleration devices of the vehicle at a shorter distance from the preceding vehicle.**

As regards this feature, the Examiner also relies on col. 5, line 40 to col. 6, line 4 of Asada et al. However, this section of Asada et al. does not identically disclose, or even suggest, first activating, given the decrease in the time gap, deceleration devices at a shorter distance from the preceding vehicle. Nowhere does Asada et al. even refer to first activating deceleration

devices at a shorter distance from the preceding vehicle. Instead, Asada et al. merely indicates “decelerat[ing] the vehicle gradually and increas[ing] the vehicle spacing gradually.” (Asada et al., col. 6, lines 3 to 4 (emphasis added)). Further, as more fully set forth above, Asada et al. also teaches away from first activating deceleration devices at a shorter distance from the preceding vehicle because it seeks to prevent “unwanted and uncomfortable acceleration or deceleration.” (Asada et al., col. 1, lines 19 to 20).

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that Asada et al. does not anticipate claim 1. Thus, claim 1 should be allowed.

Claim 5 recites features generally analogous to claim 1 and therefore is allowable for at least the similar reasons

Claim 2 depends from claim 1, and is therefore allowable for generally the same reasons, as discussed above.

In sum, for at least the reasons stated above, claims 1, 2 and 5 are allowable.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that the rejections have been obviated, and that pending and considered claims are therefore allowable. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejections be withdrawn, and that the present application issue as early as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 9, 2008

By: /Michelle M. Carniaux/
Michelle M. Carniaux (Reg. No. 36,098)

for

Gerard A. Messina
Reg. No. 35,952

KENYON & KENYON LLP
One Broadway
New York, NY 10004
Telephone: (212) 425-7200
Facsimile: (212) 425-5288
CUSTOMER NO. 26646